

REMARKS

Claims 38-57 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. The Examiner has rejected claims 38, 39, 41-44 and 49-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ubillos (U.S. 5,999,173) in view of Chang et al. (WO 98/52356) and Handelsman (U.S. 6,191,798).

Claim 38, as amended, recites the features of a correction unit operable to generate motion data for the selected component with data based on the operational contents inputted by a user interface unit, operable to save the generated motion data in an overwriting buffer in the correction unit, operable to generate a synchronized stream by synchronizing the input stream with the generated motion data in the overwriting buffer, and operable to output the synchronized stream as a corrected stream. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of cited prior art fails to teach or suggest at least these features recited in claim 38.

Regarding the Ubillos reference, Applicants note that this reference discloses an apparatus in which stored video clips are displayed, and wherein an edited video program can be assembled from selected ones of the stored video clips (see col. 1, lines 8-11). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Ubillos fails to disclose the above-noted features regarding a correction unit as recited in amended claim 1.

Regarding the Chang reference, Applicants note that Chang discloses a technique for detecting moving objects in a compressed bitstream and tools for editing compressed video (see Abstract). In particular, Chang discloses different techniques for editing compressed digital

video such as spatial scaling, translation, filtering in DCT domain, dissolve, and masking (see page 17, lines 17-18; page 18, lines 5-6; page 18, line 20; page 20, lines 1 and 17-18).

In addition, Fig. 12 of Chang depicts a system for enabling distributed clients to manipulate digital video in which a client 1260 may open any video shot stored at a server 1210, browse the keyframes hierarchically, and perform shot-level editing or frame level editing 1390 using the above-noted editing techniques such as spatial scaling, dissolve, and masking (see page 22, lines 20-22; and page 23, lines 14-24).

Thus, while Chang discloses a system which enables a client to perform shot-level editing or frame level editing using editing techniques such as spatial scaling, dissolve, and masking, Applicants respectfully submit that Chang does not disclose or suggest a correction unit operable to generate motion data for the selected component with data based on the operational contents inputted by a user interface unit, operable to save the generated motion data in an overwriting buffer in the correction unit, operable to generate a synchronized stream by synchronizing the input stream with the generated motion data in the overwriting buffer, and operable to output the synchronized stream as a corrected stream, as recited in amended claim 1.

If the Examiner disagrees and believes that Chang discloses the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to specifically explain how the disclosure of Chang is being interpreted so as to correspond to such features.

Regarding the Handelman reference, Applicants note that the Examiner has relied on this reference for the teaching of a joint angle. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Handelman does not disclose or suggest any of the above-noted features regarding a correction

unit as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the combination of cited prior art fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in amended claim 38.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 38 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested. Claims 39 and 41-43 depend from claim 38 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 44 and 51, Applicants note that these claims have been amended in a similar manner as claim 38. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as discussed above, Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in claims 44 and 51. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 44 and 51 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

Claims 49 and 50 depend from claim 44 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 52-54, Applicants note that these claims have been amended to recite similar features as noted above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claims 52-54 now recite the features of correcting the stream by generating motion data for the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; saving the generated motion data in an overwriting buffer; generating a synchronized stream by synchronizing the stream with the generated motion data in the overwriting buffer; and outputting the synchronized stream as a corrected input stream.

Accordingly, for at least similar reasons as discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicants

submit that claims 52-54 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 55-57, Applicants note that these claims have also been amended to recite similar features as noted above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claims 55-57 now recite the feature of computer readable instructions comprising instructions capable of instructing a computer to: correct the stream by generating motion data for the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; save the generated motion data in an overwriting buffer; generate a synchronized stream by synchronizing the stream with the generated motion data in the overwriting buffer; and output the synchronized stream as a corrected input stream.

Accordingly, for at least similar reasons as discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 55-57 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

B. The Examiner has rejected claims 40, 45 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ubillos in view of Chang et al. and Handelman and further in view of Bidiville et al. (U.S. 5,288,993).

Claim 40 depends from claim 38, and claims 45 and 48 depend from claim 44. Applicants respectfully submit that Bidiville fails to cure the deficiencies of Ubillos, Chang and Handelman, as noted above, with respect to claims 38 and 44. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 40, 45 and 48 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. The Examiner has rejected claims 46 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ubillos in view of Chang et al. and Handelman in view of Bidiville et al. and further in view of Svancarek (U.S. 5,793,356).

Claims 46 and 47 depend from claim 44. Applicants respectfully submit that Bidiville and Svancarek fail to cure the deficiencies of Ubillos, Chang and Handelman, as noted above, with respect to claim 44. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 46 and 48 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshiyuki MOCHIZUKI et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/abm
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 11, 2005